Remarks

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated February 5, 2009, where the Examiner has rejected claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41. In the present amendment, claims 19, 21, 24 and 25 have been amended and claim 42 has been added. Accordingly, claims 19, 21-30, 40, 41 and 42 are pending in the present application with claims 19 and 42 being the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 19, 21-30, 40, 41 and 42 in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103(a) (Claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41; Redford/Owens)

Claim 19, 21-30, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Redford, et al. US Patent No. 5,711,672 ("Redford") in view of Owens, et al. US Patent No. 5,555,416 ("Owens"). Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are not obvious with respect to Redford in view of Owens because the combination of Redford with Owens does not disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of the amended claims. Though the following remarks are directed primarily to the independent claims, they apply with equal force to each of the claims which depend therefrom.

Independent claim 19 is directed to a method of managing a plurality of user-selectable software application programs for use with a computer device in accordance with a task disk control file contained on the storage media external to or removable from the computer device. Amended Claim 19 includes the limitations of, "determining that the task disk control file indicates the presence of the plurality of user-selectable software application programs located on the storage media, wherein the task disk control file includes a plurality of task disk control

sub-files," "providing from the task disk control file a list of the plurality of software application programs located on the storage media" and "selecting one of the plurality of software application programs for execution, wherein a user performs said selecting." Redford and Owens or any combination thereof fails to address these limitations.

Redford describes a host device that recognizes an insertion of a storage media, searches for a file of a predetermined name in the storage media and automatically starts an application listed in the instructions in the file. In the Office Action it was asserted that Redford described "selecting one of the plurality of software programs for execution, wherein a user performs said selecting." The Office Action states that support for this limitation is provided in Redford (See, column 7, lines 49-62 and column 11, lines 30-32.

Claim 19, has been amended to emphasize to distinguish the software application programs from the software launching information, configuration information, storage information and clean-up information. Applicants respectfully submit that lines 49-62 of Redford merely describe a file having a predetermined name where the file contains a sequence of application start up instructions to be executed to start an application. The application start-up instructions include instructions to start an application from the inserted storage media, for example, to access a specified location on the inserted storage media, to retrieve and display certain selections contained at a location of the storage media and to execute certain application instructions located in memory. The application start-up instructions described here are simply instructions for driving the applications and are different from the applications to be run on the computer. Even if the application startup instructions were determined to be applications, Redford fails to contemplate that a user selects the application to be executed. Redford's process

is done automatically with no selections made by the user. Thus, Redford fails to describe this limitation of claim 19.

Further, it is acknowledged in the Office Action that Redford fails to explicitly disclose determining that the control file indicates the presence of the plurality of software programs located in the storage media. However, the Office Action states that Owens teaches these limitations (See Owens, Fig. 2, items 30', 36', 38' and related text and Fig. 5, steps 68, 70, 72, 74 and 76 and related text).

On the contrary, Fig. 2, Fig. 5 and related text of Owens merely illustrate the contents of a boot device, local/remote install media, the local/remote storage devices and the operation flow of the local/remote install setup and control module. While the local or remote install set-up of Owens is divided into multiple installation software including pre-install software and a post-install software, Owens fails to contemplate the limitations of claim 19. For example Owens fails to contemplate "determining that the task disk control file indicates the presence of the plurality of user-selectable software application programs located on the storage media, wherein the task disk control file includes a plurality of task disk control sub-files" and "selecting one of the plurality of software application programs for execution, wherein a user performs said selecting."

In addition, Redford and Owens, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "wherein the task disk control file includes a plurality of task disk control sub-files" and wherein the "providing special instructions in the plurality of task disk control sub-files corresponding to the plurality of software application programs, wherein the plurality of task disk control sub-files is located on the storage media, and the special instructions in each task disk control sub-file include configuration information, software launching information, data file storage information, and clean-up information." Redford describes that upon detection of insertion of a storage media,

- 10 -

the autostart driver seeks a first file having a first predetermined name such as DISGO. While Redford describes a second file with a second predetermined name where the second file contains a sequence of application start-up instructions, Redford fails to disclose that the second file is a sub-file of the first file. Thus, Redford fails to describe the limitations of claim 1.

Owens fails to teach or suggest the limitations discussed above which Redford fails to teach or suggest. Therefore, Redford and Owens, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 19.

Based on the foregoing, claim 19 should therefore be allowable over Redford and Owens. Further, since claims 21-30, 40 and 41 depend from claim 19, claims 21-30, 40 and 41 should also be allowable over Redford and Owens.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcomed by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

New Claim 42

The Examiner is respectfully requested to note that new claim 42 was added to further define the subject matter that Applicants regard as being part of the invention. No new matter has been added. Support for the limitations of claim 42 is described in paragraph 39 of the unpublished application. Redford and Owens also fail to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of independent claim 42. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 42 is also in condition for allowance.

- 11 -

<u>Conclusion</u>

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully submit that they do not acquiesce to any of the positions set forth in the Office Action(s). If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP

Dated: __April 28, 2009_____ By: /Stephen C. Beuerle/_____
Stephen C. Beuerle
Reg. No. 38,380

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP
530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 238-1900